

### **REMARKS**

The claims remaining in the application are 1-8.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 5 are found in the specifications on page 7, lines 6-30.

### **Drawings**

A copy of the formal drawings are submitted herewith with a copy of the Letter to the Official Draftsperson. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

### **Supplemental Disclosure Statement**

Enclosed herewith a Supplemental Disclosure Statement, Supplemental PTO-1449, copy of the EP Search Report, and copies of the references cited in the EP Search Report.

### **Claims Objections**

The informality in claim 4 noted in the Office Action has been corrected.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,900). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The purpose of the Ma et al. patent, extracting titles from digital images, is different from the purpose of the present invention. This difference in purpose results in a difference in structure and function of the Ma et al. patent from the claims of the present invention. The present invention is for the purpose of producing “a clean, readable binary image of a scanned document.”

In the Ma et al. patent a multi-level threshold process is used to convert the gray scale image into multiple binary images. The purpose of this is to determine where in the image the title is located. Thus, there is no need in the Ma et al. patent for “counting a number of noise dots” as in the amended claims of the present invention. Thus, the claim limitations in the amended claims of the present invention are not found in the Ma et al. patent.

The claims of the present invention, as amended, would also not be obvious in view of the Ma et al. patent, since there would be no need for counting noise dots in Ma et al.

It is also worth noting that the "index eye" mentioned in the Office Action at column 4, lines 25-33 of Ma et al. is an index of different binary images. The index as used by Ma et al. is not an image noise index as used in the present invention.

### **CONCLUSION**

Dependent claims not specifically addressed add additional limitations to the independent claims, which have been distinguished from the prior art and are therefore also patentable.

In conclusion, none of the prior art cited by the Office Action discloses the limitations of the claims of the present invention, either individually or in combination. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that additional modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tmp  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-588-2720  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Enclosures: Supplemental IDS  
Supplemental PTO-1449  
Copy of EP Search Report  
Copy of Letter to Official Draftsperson  
Copy of Formal Drawings